DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 272 971 EA 018 690

AUTHOR Creed, Philip J.
TITLE Implementing Structural Change in a State Department of Education.
PUB DATE 86
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (67th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986) as Paper 3 in the symposium "Australian Perspectives on State-Wide Educational Reform: Restructuring the Victorian Education Department."
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Change; Administrator Role; Consultants; Educational Administration; *Educational Change; Foreign Countries; Government School Relationship; Management Development; *Organizational Effectiveness; *Politics of Education
IDENTIFIERS *Australia (Victoria)

ABSTRACT

This report describes and analyzes the role played by key actors in initiating and implementing major reform in the management of the department of education in Victoria, the second largest state in Australia. Focus is during 1979-84, the time of the greatest administrative reform in the department's history. Study goals include the analysis of the following: (1) the role of government ministers of education in the tasks of administrative reform; (2) the role played by external consultants in supporting the ministers; and (3) the role of senior departmental officials in the change process. The paper's last section records reflections on the means used to implement changes. Political support was given by elected ministers of education from both parties. The wide-ranging consultative mechanisms employed by ministers of different parties are contrasted. External management consultants provided management expertise. Together with a task force of departmental officers, the consultants diagnosed organizational problems, designed a structure, and commenced implementation of an action plan. The outcomes of new plans and change processes are analyzed. Reflections are made on the decentralization of management, executive management roles, the devolution of authority to school councils, morale in a new organization, and the purpose of structural change. Seventy endnotes are appended. (CJH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED272971

AERA SYMPOSIUM

AUSTRALIAN PERSPECTIVES ON STATE-WIDE EDUCATIONAL REFORM: RESTRUCTURING THE VICTORIAN EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

PAPER 3

Implementing Structural Change in a State Department of Education

by

Philip J. Creed
Policy and Planning Unit, Ministry of Education
2 Treasury Place Melbourne
Victoria 3002
Australia

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Philip J. Creed

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association San Francisco, 1986.

EA 015 690

AUSTRALIAN PERSPECTIVES ON STATEWIDE
EDUCATIONAL REFORM

"Implementing Structural Change in a State Department of Education."

ABSTRACT

The role played by key actors in initiating and implementing change in the management of the largest Government department in the second largest State in Australia is described and analysed. The period covered is 1979 to 1984, that is, the time of the most dramatic administrative reform in the 100 year history of the Department. Successful reform on such a scale must command high levels of political support and this was given by elected Ministers of Education, both Liberal (Conservative) and Labor, who directed changes. The wide ranging consultative mechanisms employed by Ministers of different parties are contrasted. External management consultants were employed to provide management expertise. Together with a task force of departmental officers, the consultants diagnosed organisational problems, designed a structure and commenced implementation of an action plan. Subsequent to a change of Government, the direction of reform altered and the outcomes of new plans and change processes are analysed. Reflections are made on the decentralisation of management, executive management roles, the devolution of authority to school councils, morale in a new organisation and the purpose of structural change.

IMPLEMENTING CHANGE IN A STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Philip J. Creed

> It seemed that every time we were beginning to form up into teams we would be disbanded. I was to learn later in life that we tend to meet any new situation by re-organising and a wonderful method it can be for creating the illusion of progress while producing confusion, inefficiency and demoralisation.
>
> - Petronius Arbiter 57 AD

A colleague of mine in the Education Ministry in Victoria kept this quotation in large print on his office wall and he left it with me as the Ministry was about to commence another organisational change project involving substantial change in 1986. Perhaps he kept it there as a form of personal re-assurance--that despite all of the structural change being proposed, debated and implemented around him, he had an important job to do in providing a support service to schools. Maybe he thought his work and that of others like him contributed more to progress and educational reform than the work of those who found the main thrust of their activities was the restructuring of the Education Department, now known as the Ministry of Education. Though a pessimistic view of administrative reform, it was widely shared by those who wondered about the impact of the changes on the education of the students in schools. In the present climate of continuing change, this view can still be heard. However, no doubt existed in the minds of Ministers and many senior officials that substantial administrative reforms were needed. Furthermore, there are still administrative reforms that remain to be tackled.

reform is frequently externally generated, broad in scope, and intensive in its impact. Successful reform must command high levels of political support and the detailed attention of administrative and political heads. The organisational changes since 1979 were of such magnitude that it is doubtful if they could have been achieved by the administrative head and his department alone.

The basis on which the Ministers determined to proceed with a management review has been recounted by both Ministers,[11] [12] looking back on their years in office after the electoral defeat of the Liberal Party in 1982. Norman Lacy who had been chairman of the Liberal Party Education Policy Committee prior to his election to Cabinet stated that he came into the Minister's position with a well-developed preconception that a review was necessary. After one or two weeks in office he asserted that his view was confirmed. Hunt stated that within the first ten days of his Ministry he found no clear lines of communication, a high degree of duplication and triplication and that the fundamental maxim that an organisational structure must be simple to be effective had not been applied. He subsequently set out to cure these perceived ills and to implement his own view of an effective organisation.

The Dean of Education at Melbourne University[13] wondered about this situational analysis and invited many key observers of the educational scene to ponder upon the conclusion reached by Norman Lacy that the Department really was in a mess.[14] In doing so, he pointed to the grasp the previous long-serving Minister of Education, Lindsay Thompson, had of the scope of the Education portfolio. The extent of his knowledge of the system and his ability to operate it is reflected in a comment made by education journalist Maslen[15] who referred to the relationship between the political head and the administrative head prior

Whatever comfort was derived from contemplating the quotation, my colleague, like many others, could not escape the consequences of organisational change. By the time the 1982 General Election in Victoria occurred, recommendations had been accepted for the abolition of the major divisions of the department based on types of schools and colleges, the disappearance of the school inspectors, and the implementation of plans for a mass movement of head office staff to regions. In addition, the Director-General of Education had been displaced from his position.[1]

The focus of this paper is on people rather than on the organisation. First, the role of Government Ministers of Education in approaching the tasks of administrative reform is examined. The important role played by external consultants in supporting the Ministers is analysed, and then follows a discussion of the role of senior departmental officials in the change process. Amid the many twists and turns made in implementing change over the last ten years there are many lessons to be learned about organisational change. The last section of the paper records some reflections on the means used to implement the changes, in the hope that these lessons are made plain.

The Role of Ministers of Education

The Nature of their Role

An important feature of the restructuring of Government departments of education that has occurred in Australian States has been the central role played by the Minister. In Victoria, the most extensive organisational change in our history began in May 1979 with the return of the Liberal Government by a very narrow majority, and the appointments of Alan Hunt as Minister of

Education and of Norman Lacy as Assistant Minister. They presided over the largest Government department in Victoria and an organisation that employs about one percent of Australia's total work force. Alan Hunt did not want the job and made that clear with an expletive in response to the appointment.[2] However, the clear perception around the corridors of the Department was that Hunt had been appointed to "tidy up" the largest Government department.[3] He was understood to be a Liberal Party strong man who was encouraged to restore order in industrial relations with the three major teacher unions and to put Departmental affairs in order.

The Ministers began by announcing a major organisational review of the Department in May 1979.[4] The review was to determine the major aims and objectives, the types of strategies that would be needed to best attain those aims and objectives, and the administrative organisational and structural changes needed to implement those strategies. The initial expectation was that this ambitious review would be completed in three months. However, some of the outcomes of the review had already been determined.[5] Minister Hunt had stressed that the review would provide a framework for the devolution of authority under which more specific roles and responsibilities of school councils could be developed. It is in this context that a comment about the structural changes by the former Deputy Director-General[6] should be examined. Reflecting the views of many of the professional administrators in the department, he stated that the fear, largely supported in the sequel, was that the nature of the organisational change was largely pre-determined. The view was that we were going through an expensive and disruptive exercise simply to satisfy political ends.

The important point to note was that it was the Minister, not the administrative head, the Director-General of Education, who initiated and later directed the extensive organisational change process that began in 1979. Prior to this time, the Director-General had initiated major changes in the organisational structure. These changes included the establishment of the first regional pattern of administration, and revisions to the divisional structures to make them more effective. The independent Teachers Tribunal made the necessary structural decisions and approved the creation of positions within the structure in response to submissions made by the department. The Director-General also initiated and implemented major changes that resulted in representative school councils being given some executive powers in managing grants paid to schools and in maintaining school facilities. In addition, the school council was given joint responsibility with the school principal for determining local school educational policies. The changes made by the Director-General certainly set the scene for the dramatic changes that were to come. Inadequate recognition has been given to the significance of these changes[7] and to the creation of the climate for organisational change that facilitated changes in the years following 1979. As Dr. Moore, then Deputy Director-General stated,the Ministers failed to take account of these change processes and in fact subsumed them in their own organisational review.[8]

The changes initiated by the administrative head, the Director-General, appear to be best described as evolutionary, and what might have been expected as part of normal organisational life. They were changes of an internal self-adjustment kind, gradually undertaken and not part of publicised long-term strategy plan. In this sense the changes that occurred prior to 1979 exemplify incrementalism.[9] However, following the return of the Liberal Government the changes are best described in terms of Dror's[10] view of administrative reform as directed change of the main features of the administrative system. Such

to 1979 as a "Tweedledum - Tweedledee" relationship. While it may be argued that the analysis of the Minister was rather too facile, the result was intervention in the direction of organisational structural change in the department.

Political influence in the restructuring of the department continued with the change of government in 1982. The newly appointed Labor Minister of Education, Robert Fordham, intervened to stop the appointment of persons to 59 senior and middle level management positions.[16] He had stated prior to the election that the Labor Party would accept the appointments made to the top four positions. Further, the new Minister made it clear that in the Labor Party and among relevant community groups there was an expectation that he would intervene in the direction being taken by the organisational change process at the time.

Ministerial direction of the further restructuring of the department continued with the appointment of the present Minister, Ian Cathie, following the return of the Labor Government in 1985. On the 11 November 1985, the Director-General resigned as administrative head of the Department and on the following day the Minister announced the demise of the Department and the creation of a Ministry. The change was effected by an administrative device, that is, by amending a schedule to the Public Service Act, 1974. The Minister stated in Parliament[17] that the creation of a Ministry of Education was just the first of a series of changes aimed at completely restructuring education in Victoria and ensuring that the administration was much more effective and efficient. The Minister also stated his intention to expedite the process of devolving authority to schools and regions.

The Labor Government remained firmly committed to the devolution process as a means of improving the quality of education in schools. The Minister claimed that experience has proven effective education occurs when school communities exercise responsibility for curriculum decision-making within the framework of guidelines issued by the Minister. The purpose of the central administration in a devolved system of education was defined as supporting schools in their work. As a result there had to be a fundamental reshaping of the central administration. In conjunction with devolution of authority to schools and regions, the Ministry was required to progressively transfer services and resources to the regions. Consequently, the size of the central administration was to be reduced over time.

The role of the Ministers in the Labor administration elected in 1982 was reframed to establish clearly Cabinet, that is, political supremacy in Government affairs.[18] The Premier, in prescribing the role of his Ministers, likened them to Executive Directors rather than Chairmen of Boards of Directors. Hence, the Government has strengthened the role of Ministers vis a vis their departments. The Labor Ministers of Education therefore have been following an agreed Government-wide strategy in actively managing the direction and nature of administrative reform. To further strengthen political control of organisational change the Labor Ministers have employed Ministerial advisors to provide administrative support and frequently to mediate between the Minister and his senior departmental officers. In Education, persons with strong Labor Party and teacher union backgrounds have been employed in these positions. For senior public servants who previously dealt with these advisors in their former roles, this represented a significant change. However, the administrative head and his senior officers have been left in no doubt about the central role of the Ministers in restructuring the Department. This has been true since 1979 under both Liberal and Labor Government administrations.

Strategies Adopted by the Ministers

Norman Lacy, the Assistant Minister appointed in 1979,[19] began campaigning for support for a management review while a backbencher within the Liberal Government, and later he won Party support. Hence Government support upon his appointment as a Minister was assured. He quickly established an administrative support group from among sympathetic officers within the Education Department and set about the Review. Minister Hunt had received advice from the Director-General and his administrative officers following widespread discussion within the Department related to "controversial issues" in structuring the department. However, he made it clear that he wanted to involve teachers, parents and school councils in a widespread and public debate about the aims and objectives, strategies and structures of the education system.[20] Further, it was agreed that a Consultative Committee chaired by the Assistant Minister should be established to review the public submissions. This Committee,though chaired by the Assistant Minister, comprised professional educators from tertiary institutions and high status members of the community who were expected to provide independent advice. The detail of the consultative processes employed has been recorded and analysed elsewhere by Reed,[21] a senior officer who was involved in supporting the processes. In discussing these processes, he warns that with retrospective analysis there is a danger of ascribing a certain coherence not necessarily planned at the time to the course of events. Nevertheless, the significant point to be made is that it was the Ministers who made the final decisions and delivered the statement of Aims and Objectives of Education in Victoria in Parliament on the 12 December 1979. In preparing this statement the Ministers had utilised advice from departmental officers, in particular from the Deputy Director-General who had been given this task, but substantially from the Consultative Committee that had reviewed approximately 500 public submissions.

The next stage of the management review was the tabling of the Government White Paper on Strategies and Structures for Education in Victorian Government Schools in Parliament on 10 December 1980. This document was arguably one of the most significant of the policy papers ever produced in Victorian education. The White Paper was very much the product of the Minister of Education and of his Assistant Minister who was determined that key elements were written into the document. Norman Lacy approached this phase with a clear direction in mind.[22] He supported the regionalisation of administration, devolution of authority to school councils, changes in the role of the inspectors and local school selection of principals. In doing so, he believed that he had the support of the Labor Party shadow Minister of Education and the Federation of State School Parents Clubs. Right from the outset, decentralisation and devolution were the key items on the organisational change agenda. A variety of strategies was used on the way to the development of the White Paper. The principal strategy was the development of a preliminary discussion paper, a Green Paper.[23] This paper was published in the name of the Ministers and was prepared by them deliberately to provoke discussion and reaction. They had before them quite different drafts of a possible "White Paper" prepared by the Consultative Committee and the Deputy Director-General, but in fact they used little of this material as a result of a deliberate political choice. In all, 935 responses to the Green Paper were received from the public. In addition, the Regional Directors were invited to hold public meetings on the Green Paper issues and then to report to the Assistant Minister--a portent of the changes to come.

Another significant strategy was the establishment of an Organisations Reference Group[24] to advise the Minister, to make known the views and policies of the organisation they represented, to examine the concepts aired in the Green Paper and to explore areas where consensus could be achieved. The group

eventually comprised 16 members. It should be noted that the three major teacher unions withdrew from membership following the inclusion of the Victorian Association of Teachers. This organisation was described by other teacher unions as a "company union" created and nurtured by the previous Minister of Education. Hence the Minister did not receive formal advice from the three major teacher unions through this strategy. However, in the Minister's view the strategy was described as successful because substantial sections of the Organisations Reference Group's well considered response were incorporated in the White Paper.

The consultant editor employed to draft the White Paper was carefully chosen by the Minister.[25] Dr. Grant Harman was recognised as an outstanding contributor to the discussion of Green Paper issues. He had understood that the prime objective of the Minister at this stage of the process was to review the management, not the educational policies and practices, of the Department.

The crucial role played by the Ministers was reflected by the time and intense effort put into preparation for drafting the White Paper. Both went into retreat for a week and read all the submissions from major organisations, other significant submissions and summaries of all submissions.[26] At the end of this period they conferred with the Director-General and together they agreed on the major principles that were to form the basis of the White Paper. With minor amendments added to the final draft by the Parliamentary Liberal Party Education Committee, the document was then presented to Parliament on the 10 December 1980 as Government policy. In adding the finishing touches, Norman Lacy[27] was very concerned to see that regionalisation and school council input into the selection of principals were retained as central policies in the White Paper.

At this point, the Minister handed formal responsibility for policy implementation to the Assistant Minister, Norman Lacy. Continued Ministerial involvement was maintained by the Assistant Minister through his chairmanship of an Implementation Steering Committee put together to implement Government policy. This Committee comprised the Ministers, the two top administrative officers, the Chairman of the Public Service Board, a captain of industry and an eminent academic in administration. Hence the Minister maintained a central role in directing and managing organisational change.[28] He also maintained the high level external expertise to provide advice as he had done throughout the change process to date. At this point the strategies used by the Ministers involved engaging external consultants and adopting means to gain commitment from administrators within the Department. These strategies are discussed below in discussion of the roles of consultants and senior departmental officials.

With the change of Government in April 1982, quite different approaches to change were adopted. The new Labor Minister of Education and Deputy Premier, Robert Fordham, brought to an end the processes being pursued by the previous Liberal Government. The Implementation Steering Committee was abandoned, as was the task group that was assisting in putting into effect the planned organisational change. However, Robert Fordham retained the Ministerial initiative in directing and approving proposals for organisational change that had been evident throughout the preceding Liberal Government's term of office. The strategy employed to review the changes that had occurred to date and the direction of future change was to establish a representative review committee chaired by an eminent educator who was acceptable to all education interest groups and to the Minister.[29] Because the Review Committee was to be the first major participative working party established by the new Minister, there was considerable interest in its membership. The committee consisted of three

teacher union representatives, two parent representatives from the major parent and school council interest groups, a school principal, three newly appointed senior administrators, the chairperson of the Labor Party Education Policy Committee and two Ministerial advisors who had been appointed to their positions from within the Party. The key difference in the strategy adopted was the utilisation of interest group representatives rather than the employment of persons with expertise in management or administration and with experience in directing large scale organisational change. In general terms, this applied whether or not the persons with expertise were available inside or external to the Department. Acceptability and consensus among the chosen group representatives was the prime criterion for employment of the particular strategy used by the Minister. Some structural modifications were made and a change in the style of management and the implementation of organisational change resulted. Nevertheless, the chairperson of the Labor Party Education Policy Committee and former executive secretary of the parent's organisation lamented that there was insufficient time for a full scale review.[30] The changes that were made were determined by the Minister in response to recommendations made by the Labor Government's Review Committee. Thus, the crucial role of the Minister in the overall organisational change process continued.

Following the General Election in March 1985, the Labor Party Government was returned to office and subsequently a new Minister for Education was appointed. Like his predecessor, the new Minister for Education continued the central role of the Minister in implementing structural change. This was made apparent when he announced on 12 November, 1985, changes to be made to the administrative structure. The strategies to be used in effecting organisational change are currently being determined. However it is clear that the Minister will chair a

Steering Committee, establish consultative mechanisms for a range of interest groups and set up a project team comprising Public Service Board officers and managers from within his department to direct the change process.

Of particular importance is the strategy to appoint a new top management structure for the Ministry. The new administrative head to replace the Director-General as administrative head of the Education Department has been titled the Chief Executive. The title itself is descriptive of the intention of the Minister. The advertisement[31] for the position called for a person with outstanding achievement in the management of a major commercial or public enterprise and a demonstrable commitment to public education. Since experience in the education profession is described only as an advantage, the clear message is that first and foremost, an effective manager is desired.

Important differences existed in the strategies employed by Liberal and Labor Ministers especially in relation to the consultative process used. The Liberal Ministers sought widespread public support from within the education community and the general community for administrative reforms. In contrast, the Labor Ministers sought the active support and participation of nominated key interest groups in implementing organisational change. However, the common element in the strategies used has been the breadth of appeal for opinions and expertise in developing organisational change. Departmental officials have not been left to their own devices in developing the management structure within which they work.

The Role of External Consultants

The Employment of Consultants by the Liberal Government

In pursuing the restructuring of the State Department of Education both Liberal and Labor Party Governments have made extensive use of external consultants to assist in the organisational change process.

Once the Liberal Government had determined its policy, as outlined in the White Paper, implementation of a new organisational structure during the remainder of its term in office became a high priority. To do this, the Assistant Minister sought to commission external management consultants.[32] For him, this strategy was an extension of the original strategy to conduct a management review making use of expertise outside the Department. For him, the eventual decision to commission the management consultancy agency, PA Australia, was crucial and in taking this stance he was supported by the Implementation Steering Committee. As one member, the Managing Director of Dulux Australia[33] stated it, putting a new organisational structure in place is a difficult thing to do, even if you are totally committed to the change. Most do this only once or twice in a life-time and most within the Department had never done it.

A different view of the implementation strategy required had been held by administrators within the Department. The change required to implement Government policy was not seen in the same radical terms. The Deputy Director-General at the time[34] believed that the key elements of the new structure already existed and that evolutionary change rather than revolutionary change was desirable. He argued that change could have been achieved more successfully from within the system by personnel expert in

educational administration and knowledgeable of the norms and traditions of system. However that was not to be. The vision of the new organisation was one where all the jobs were to change at the same time. Within it, the whole social and professional interrelationship of people was to change, together with all the systems, the flow of information, the power structure, responsibilities, and the way individuals were to be required to behave.[35]

The Implementation Steering Committee also held consultations with the Director-General of Education in New Zealand. He was perceived to be an administrative head of a highly devolved system of education and therefore was regarded as a valuable educational consultant to the Steering committee. In addition, management consultants from the Public Service Board were deployed to work with departmental officers to assist PA Australia. Thus, the Minister sought to ensure a maximum level of consultancy expertise was available to him in implementing a new organisational structure.

A Consultant's Viewpoint

PA viewed their role[36] as that of a catalyst to get the change process started within the Education Department. In approaching the consultancy assignment, PA grouped the themes of the White Paper into three main clusters--re-organisation with its emphasis on strengthening regional offices and a corresponding emphasis on greater efficiency and economy, redistribution which would address aspects of devolution that foster participation in educational governance, and review processes that envisaged internal evaluation within schools and periodic external evaluation of educational programs or schools, or both.

On the recommendation of the consultants, the decision was made to proceed with re-organisation first and to leave redistribution and review to a later date. This was in accord with the Minister's wishes. However, in retrospect, it can easily be seen that this decision provided the basis for the criticism and lack of acceptance among interest groups of the structure and action plan that was eventually proposed by PA. These groups were primarily concerned about the redistribution of power and this had been the basis of the general acceptance of the White Paper. The view of the consultants[37] was that unless the existing centralist administrative power structure was modified, no real devolution could occur and so this became the first priority.

In approaching their task PA drew attention to[38] three requirements that must be kept in mind in working with the public sector, in contrast to the private sector. The first was to design a structure that would work independent of the personal style of the incumbent of any position. This requirement appeared to be most relevant in the Education Department because the culture and tradition was one that emphasised a collegial style of management with consensus decision-making. The consultant's view was that an organisation built on this principle becomes ineffective when mutual trust breaks down or information flow is impeded. An incumbent needs clear position power and the ability to impose sanctions so that decisions can be made and schools and departmental branches can be held to account. Secondly, the consultants believed it necessary to design a structure consistent with the call for increased accountability by public servants. Freedom of Information legislation, the appointment of an ombudsman, and greater Ministerial accountability were recent changes consistent with this call. Thirdly, the perception held by the consultants was that organisational change in the public sector is difficult to achieve when compared to the comparative ease with which private sector change occurs. For this reason a stable basic design was required. The new design had to be

sufficiently different from the past structure that people appointed to new positions could not revert to former roles and were at least inhibited from reintroducing old relationships. Clearly, very significant organisational change was on the agenda of the consultants. The publication of the PA report,[39] revealed the significance of the changes that were to be implemented.

A Labor Government View

Though PA have not been able to win any consultancy contracts in education since the change of Government in 1982, extensive use has still been made of management consultants from the private sector. Consultancy has become the preferred tool of change in all departments of Government in Victoria.[40] The strategy has been used as a potent means of effecting fast, but controllable change sensitive to the political will of the Labor Party in Government. For example, within Education, consultancy services have been extensively used to introduce program budgeting at system level and within schools. The former Treasury was reconstituted to create a Department of Management and Budget, thus giving emphasis to the concern of the Government to improve management in the public sector. A comprehensive program budgeting system which seeks to combine high levels of strategic control with equally high levels of management autonomy was, and still is regarded as the major mechanism for improvement.[41]

Program budgeting at school level is being implemented in such a way as to complement the development of the changed administrative structure.[42] Increased devolution of authority to school councils is a major theme of the restructure, hence program budgeting has been adapted to what Americans would recognise as school site budget management. A significant difference is

incorporation within the approach to school level program budgeting of a major emphasis on curriculum planning and school council participation in the policy making processes that underpin the budgeting processes.

The Government has also restructured the Public Service Board to give more emphasis to a management consultancy role in its relationships with other departments. Hence, it was not surprising that the current Minister for Education sought advice from this source when announcing his own plans to restructure the department in November 1985. So after 100 years the Education Department disappeared along with the administrative head, the Director-General, to be replaced by a new Ministry of Education and a managerially-oriented Chief Executive. In response to teacher union criticism about lack of consultation with them, the Minister is reported to have queried their claimed role.[43] He stated that it was a management structure that he was concerned with and that he had consulted with the Public Service Board. Obviously the assumption was that the necessary expertise he required was to be found in the Board. The Minister has shown the importance he attaches to the use of consultants as tools for change in the department. Further, he has demonstrated a concern for means as well as ends, and therefore it is expected that consultants will be briefed with specifications that encompass far more than defining political goals and objectives. The political approach to organisational change, as traditionally understood by departmental managers and political analysts,[44] is seen to be an inadequate approach to political control of the change process. Consistent with experience within the department since 1979, an executive management approach will be maintained by the Minister. Management consultants will continue to be used by the Minister as part of his strategy to maintain control and direction of organisational change.

support for change would be generated. One important feature of the strategy used to involve senior staff was to make members of the Task Force directly responsible to the Minister. The purpose of this arrangement was, in part, to deal with the many different strategies for resistance to change that were anticipated.[46] The Ministers were quite determined to introduce the radical changes foreshadowed in the White Paper. The arrangement also had the effect of leaving senior officers free to respond to the consultants with innovative options. In encouraging this approach, the consultants used various team building strategies that were designed to dissuade senior officers from advocating the interests of their former managerial interests. As events transpired, the consultants were very successful in achieving their objectives. However, the strategies used did result in the kind of criticism made by the former Deputy Director-General. He identified as a major problem[47] the lack of meaningful consultation between those who were directing the change and those who were affected by it. There were few opportunities for reasonable dialogue between those involved in developing change proposals and the department's senior administrators,[48] including the Director-General. To most staff in the Department it appeared that the new organisation was to be the result of change by edict--a process that rarely rests comfortably in a human services organisation.

Following the tabling of the PA Report in Parliament in September 1981, and the announcement of acceptance of its major recommendations by the Ministers at the same time, deliberate strategies were put in place to involve all senior administrators. These strategies took two major forms. Initially an extensive information dissemination program was undertaken. It had become obvious that confusion and rumour about the extent and nature of the changes were rife. Though the Minister had specifically stated that any changes to educational practice would be introduced gradually and following consultation, many

The Role of Departmental Administrators

Under a Liberal Government

Prior to the tabling of the White Paper in 1980 setting out Government policy on organisational change, the role of the senior officers within the department had been one of providing advice to the administrative heads, the Director-General and his deputy. Before 1979, restructuring the department consistent with Government policy objectives had been the prerogative of the administrative head, but since that time his role has been reduced to that of offering advice. Further, as has been pointed out, departmental advice has not been the sole source, nor even the most important source of advice in the administrative reform movement.

After the tabling of the White Paper, senior officers in the department were asked to perform a different role again. On the advice of the management consultants commissioned by the Minister to implement Government policy, several senior officers were invited to join an Implementation Task Force. In the words of the consultants,[45] what was needed were the "high fliers", those people who were seen as probable leaders of the Department within the next five years. Obviously it was impossible for the Director-General to make available on a full-time basis these types of officers from all sections, but the intention of the consultants and the Minister was clear. The strategy was to provide practical experience in organisational change and to gain commitment from those who were probably to be influential in implementing change in the years ahead. Further, if consensus could be obtained from such a group as to the best educational solutions to the perceived structural issues then powerful

teachers and administrators thought otherwise. The public relations exercise was designed to make it clear the changes to be made were administrative changes that would facilitate genuine devolution of authority. The second strategy was the establishment of a multitude of working parties that were charged with the task of detailing the organisational structure of the component parts as outlined in the PA Report. The working party reports were regarded as key documents of advice to the Department's new top management who were appointed a few months after the PA Report was made public. Apart from gaining acceptance through involvement, the strategy employed also permitted the utilisation of the expertise of officers in the Department in developing technically better solutions.

The strategies employed were partially successful as many of the reports provided the basis for action that was pursued many months later. As the reports dealt with working relationships to be developed and other specific operational matters, the structural arrangements devised in many areas of the new organisation survived the change of Government from Liberal to Labor in 1982. However, the continued existence of a group of officers put together to support the new Director-General in installing the new structure could not be tolerated by those advising the new Minister. Such a task group was politically unacceptable. As a consequence, the further development of the department was left entirely in the hands of newly appointed senior officers, overburdened by coming to terms with their new operational responsibilities. The result was that an organisational malaise set into the Department as the pace of change slowed and the directions being taken became unclear.

Under a Labor Government

With the change in Government the principal objective of the restructuring became the establishment of participative decision-making structures. The role of the senior officers in restructuring changed again to encompass the development of partnership relationships with a range of interest groups representing teachers, parents and school councils, as well as Labor Party committees. Reformed school councils and the creation of Regional and State Boards were the most significant structural expression of the changed direction in the restructuring of the department.[49] At school level, school council structures changed to provide for specified proportions of elected parents, teachers and students in the case of secondary schools, with a provision for co-option of additional members. Legislation was amended to make school councils responsible, within the framework of overall State policy guidelines, for the educational policies and plans of its school. Regional Boards were also established such that the majority of members were elected from school councils in the region. The Regional Director became the executive officer of the Board and an ordinary voting member, thus emphasising the partnership nature of its operations. A State Board of Education was established by legislation as an independent and alternative source of advice to the Minister. The Board grew out of the alliance of the three major teacher unions and the two major state-wide parent and school councils organisations. This coalition of interest groups had actively campaigned against the former Liberal Government in attempting to change the nature of the restructuring of the department.[50] Senior departmental officers were expected to operate in a participative mode in working with various State Board committees.

To many departmental administrators it seemed that the movement towards devolution of authority and the decentralisation of management operations had stalled during the early years of the Labor Government. A Devolution Process Study conducted jointly by the State Board and the Department was instigated to examine these issues. One of the terms of reference for the study[51] was to clarify structure, processes and relationships and thereby contribute to (1) improvement in public participation and means of access and (2) improvement of morale of departmental and school staff and school councillors. In the course of the study, many organisational issues relating to devolution and decentralisation were identified. None were as difficult to resolve as those concerned with personnel management. The staffing of schools and all associated personnel issues remain, for the most part, highly centralised operations. The view of many senior officers is that significant progress towards decentralisation cannot be achieved until personnel operations are decentralised and devolved to match the significantly decentralised curriculum and facilities functions. However, as the Director-General at the time pointed out, attempts by departmental administrators to devolve personnel functions have met considerable teacher union opposition. It is in this context that the will of the current Minister in proceeding with his program of administrative reform will be severely tested.

Reflections

"Top-Down" versus "Bottom-Up" Change

The proposition that Victoria has used an essentially "top-down" approach in pursuit of their "bottom-up" objective of devolution[52] is one that requires further examination. If the crucial role played by the Ministers of Education of whatever political hue is acknowledged as "top-down" direction, then the proposition could be regarded as confirmed. However, an analysis of the pressures faced by a Minister makes it clear that their political positions have been determined in response to pressures from the "bottom" of the organisation. This is apparent in the account provided by the Assistant Minister[53] in determining that a management review of the Department was necessary. He wrote of his experiences as a local member and his relationships with schools in highly negative terms. In particular he referred to the problems school communities had in resolving facilities matters and of the accounts of teachers with respect to their views of the departmental administration. He found the inability of his school community to have a say about who should be appointed as the new school principal particularly galling. It was the summation of countless experiences of this nature that had led to the acceptance at Government level of the need for a management review.

In 1971, in an effort to overcome some of these organisational problems, appointments of Regional Directors to three pilot regions in country areas were made.[54] In making these appointments, the Minister stated that the purpose of regionalisation was to bring some measure of administration and decision-making closer to the schools and the people connected to them. Regionalisation was

later extended to cover all of the State and transfers of functions to regional administrations, often in response to submissions argued by regional directors, began to occur.[55] In 1977, the chairperson of the Liberal Party Education Policy Committee reported to the then Minister[56] that in the eyes of country politicians regionalisation was a success story. Though less successful in metropolitan Melbourne, it was reasonable to argue that from that time forward, regionalisation and consequently decentralisation, was bound to become Government policy.

Parent organisations had also been campaigning for a greater say in educational decision-making, as had the teacher organisations. The Director-General during the seventies stated[57] that he had developed definitive policy papers related, among other things, to putting "power where the action is"--into the schools and their communities. This had been done in response to the demands of a better educated community. The coalition of the three major teacher unions, the parents and the larger school council organisation certainly was held together by their opposition to a Liberal Government that had held power for 27 years and their united front on gaining increased levels of control at school council level.[58] There can be no doubt that "bottom-up" influences were very significant in creating the need for organisational change and in determining the direction of change. The successes of administrative reform in Victoria are more accurately attributed to "top-down" strategies for the implementation of Government policy in response to well orchestrated "bottom-up" pressures for change.

Devolution and Consensus

Although different implementation strategies were used and substantially different emphases were apparent, Liberal and Labor Ministers were determined to devolve authority to schools. This was a significant reason for their intervention in the restructuring of the Education Department. Under Labor one of the basic principles of administrative reform was stated as genuine devolution of authority and responsibility to the school community.[67]

Implementation of this principle needs to be examined in the context of an understanding of the school community. School Council membership reform guidelines provided for parents to constitute no less than half a primary school council and one-third a post-primary school council, whereas staff were to constitute no more than half a primary school council and one-third a post-primary school council. Provision was made for up to one-fifth of the total membership to be coopted by the elected council, to represent community interests.[68]

In a survey[69] of over 2000 school councils after implementation of the reforms, it was found that over 32,000 people were members of school councils. These data demonstrate the high level of participation in school governance by the community. However, the administrative reform guidelines meant a significant change in the balance of membership on school councils and the loss of many interested persons from the wider community as members. Following promulgation of the reform guidelines, a vigorous campaign was conducted by the primary teachers' union to ensure that teachers did take up to fifty per cent of the membership. Primary School Councils had been almost entirely composed of parents, but after implementation of the reforms the balance of membership changed in the direction of the teachers. The numbers of parents participating

Reorganisation versus Redistribution

In reflecting on the new structure agreed to by the Liberal Government, the Executive Secretary of the Parents Federation[59] asserted that had the Ministers involved them and other organisations in developing the structure it would have been better received. She supposed that a representative and participatory process would have produced a quite different product to that which was tabled in Parliament as the PA Report. Perhaps she was right. Certainly as a member of the new Labor Government in 1982, and often referred to as the "shadow Government Minister of Education" she was influential in developing policy for reformed school councils and in establishing representative regional boards.

However, her quarrel was not really with the PA management consultants or the senior officers and others developing the new organisational structure. The opposition of the parent and school councils organisations was ensured by the decision of the Minister to tackle first an administrative reorganisation and to leave redistribution of powers to a later date. The consequence of this decision was that devolution of authority and the development of participative decision making structures would only be dealt with in a cursory manner. While good reasons were advanced for approaching the implementation of the Government White Paper policies on restructuring the department in this way, loss of interest group support was inevitable. The basis of the general acceptance of the White Paper was that all groups could identify with one or more of the six major themes[60] underlying the administrative changes to which the Government was committed. By choosing not to deal with devolution of authority the Liberal Government lost the opportunity to gain support for what was otherwise a sound technical solution to administrative reorganisation problems.

A noted historian put the issue in perspective. He stated[61] that the history of the Victorian Education Department makes it clear that increased administrative efficiency has never been a precursor to community involvement: it has been alternative to it. To him two key themes of the White Paper--administrative reorganisation and devolution--are not complementary, but are in fact conflicting. Victoria has a history of seventy years of an ineffective Council of Public Education and a century of powerless advisory school committees to demonstrate the point being made.

Since the mid-seventies, a successive series of reforms has increased the powers and responsibilities of school councils. However, the administration dilemmas caused by a restructuring that has focussed on both reorganisation and devolution to varying extents remains at the centre of the continuing organisational change debate. American research[62] on school board-administrative staff relationships may well provide constructive lessons for Victorians. Of particular interest would be the applicability of the research findings to relationships between the newly formed Regional Boards of Education and regional administrative staff, and between the school staff and the School Councils that now have educational policy as well as executive responsibilities.

Ministerial versus Management Responsibilities

The crucial role played by the Ministers in the restructuring process, as described in this paper, represented a significant shift in the balance of powers between the political head and the administrative head of the Education Department. While there can never be any doubt about the political subordination of managers, the potential for conflict exists and has always

existed. The possibility for a heightening of this tension is apparent in the type of appointment sought for the new Chief Executive position, following the resignation of the former Director-General who was a noted academic and educator. While experience in education would be seen as an advantage for the new executive, first and foremost he is required to demonstrate achievement in management. In the past, a distinction between political and educational leadership has been a useful division of responsibility for resolution of potential conflict situations. However, the active management role played by Ministers since 1979 and the possible recruitment and appointment of an expert manager will bring a new dimension to political head-administrative head relationships.

When commenting on the proposed changes in the senior management structure put forward by Liberal Government, one academic[63] described them as the end of a settlement that had defined education as an apolitical administrative activity for a century. The concern of the new Labor Government for effective management of the public sector and the executive role played by the Ministers suggests the comment is equally applicable to them. An education journalist hinted at this in his comment on the new reorganisation initiatives about to be undertaken by the current Minister. When observing that a new and efficient Ministry is to be based upon corporate management strategies, he suggested that the conservatives appear to have invaded the Labor Party.[64] While it is unfortunate that journalists try to pin political labels to effective management strategies it illustrates the consequences of Ministers assuming an active management role.

In the context of this discussion, the reminders of the historians may serve Victoria well. A Royal Commission[65] to enquire into the administration of education in Victoria at the turn of the century concluded that docile civil

servants had allowed political considerations to dictate their duty to them. For example, the evidence presented suggested school inspectors reports had been censored by senior civil servants in anticipation of the wishes of their political masters. While not suggesting the same subservience existed under the Liberal Government, one historian[66] asserted that the study of organisational history has produced one axiom. He states that if there is any chance for an administrative structure to be exploited by political figures, it eventually will be. In making this assertion he pointed to the extension of Ministerial powers to appoint Regional Directors of Education and alluded to the chances of such exploitation.

Under the current Labor Government the extended provisions for the appointment of senior managers have continued. Further, in strengthening his executive role, the Minister has appointed several advisers from outside the Education Department and has continued many other practices which strengthen political control over the departmental bureaucracy. However, Victoria has a long history of active campaigns to reduce political influence in educational decision-making. For this reason the future balance of responsibilities between the political head and the administrative head is a matter of considerable interest to all, including educational researchers. The uneasy balance between political and management interests and the inherent tension in the relationships may well result in a continuing strengthening of support for devolution, particularly for Regional Boards of Education. Increased powers for the allocation of resources to schools at the expense of the centralised branches would seem an inevitable consequence of attempts to reduce political influences.

in school governance on all school councils, including primary school councils, actually reduced by almost ten per cent. The Association of Councils of Technical Institutions in Victoria (ACTIV) was particularly concerned about the reform proposals. They attacked the guidelines for ignoring democratic choices on membership made by technical schools in the past. The basis of their disagreement was that implementation of the guidelines meant loss of representation of the wider school community. In particular loss of expertise from business, industry and local government people was a matter of great concern.[70]

Government policy on school council reforms resulted in large measure from a consensus among the three major teacher unions, the Parents Federation and the larger school councils organisation. These are the major interest groups that are represented on the State Board of Education. The thrust of the reform supported by the interest groups has been to promote the notion of partnership between parents and teachers, and also with students in secondary schools, in school governance. Schools are expected to be responsive to their local school communities, that is, predominantly to parents, teachers and students. This is an introspective view of school governance. Local school community is not defined in terms of the local government bodies or the plethora of local church groups, service organisations and sporting clubs that make up the social fabric of a local community. Hence devolution in its current form needs to be understood as devolution to parents, teachers and students who are demanding a greater say in decision-making at school level.

Morale in a Restructured Organisation

One of the greatest costs of the administrative reforms has been the loss of professional expertise to the department and the severe morale problems that have been experienced among all administrative staff. It is noteworthy that these are the major issues identified and discussed by the former Director-General in discussing the difficulties in implementing organisational change. Placed at a pivotal point in the organisation as change was taking place, he became fully aware of the difficulties as many organisational issues, unable to be dealt with at lower levels of the organisation, found their way to his "In-tray". The change of Government in 1982 extended the length of the change period and made the situation worse. As the Director-General described it, the state of uncertainty, and the continual criticism from others, had badly affected morale and the group felt embattled.[71]

As the waves of appointments to the new organisation were made in the years that followed 1982, many senior officers failed to find acceptance from teacher union and parent representatives on selection panels and consequently lost career opportunities they had come to expect. A consequence was a severe loss of professional expertise in many functional areas.

To return to the quote which introduced this paper, it can be understood with ease why many wondered whether the fuss created achieved any more than to create the illusion of progress. A former Deputy Director-General assessed the cost of the organisational change in terms of need to rebuild an efficient public system of administration out of chaos.[72] While many senior officers would not accept this view as a reasonable estimate of the cost of the changes, this expression of it can be taken as indicative of the morale problems that were created.

A Perspective on Change

After so many years of growth and relative stability in management in the Government school system, there is a growing realisation that significant organisational change is not a once-in-a-life-time event. But the situation in Victoria is not unique to Australia. Organisational change has reflected and will continue to reflect such pressures for change as increased parent, student and teacher participation in school governance and wider representation of interest groups in policy formulation processes.

Organisational structures do matter.[73] Particular structures help or hinder the efforts of administrative staff in providing advice, information and support services. Further, members of the public, schools and other organisations have the right of ready access to that management system to express their views and to participate in policy making. For this reason the recently expressed concern of the Dean of Education at Melbourne University is important. He echoed a commonly-felt concern that excessive tampering with the bureaucracy in recent years has created instability. "I think the real problem is that there is a lot of uncertainty as to who is going to attend to what," he said.[74]

The seemingly automatic response of Ministers to perceived organisational problems is to restructure their departments. The assumption is that Government institutions may be structured to facilitate certain policy outcomes determined by Party policy committees. In reflecting on the Victorian experience and the rationale for the changes, the warning given by Dye[75] seems particularly pertinent. He states that we may discover that both structure and policy are determined largely by environmental forces--social, economic and political. So, although structures do matter in education, they may not be as

critical to policy outcomes as the almost frenetic activity of the past years and the promise of more to come would have us believe. The quality of student-teacher relationships remains the heart of the educational enterprise. Perhaps it is timely to suggest that future educational reform policies should be more sharply focussed on relationships within schools. In this context, the assumption of the Victorian changes, that devolution of authority to school councils is a means of improving the quality of education, should be now more rigorously tested by educational researchers.

NOTES

1. Geoff. Maslen, education editor for "The Age" newspaper summarised the outcomes of the structural changes in similar, though not entirely accurate, terms on the editorial page (p.11), when reviewing the book Frazer, Dunstan and Creed (eds.), Perspectives on Organisational Change: Lessons from Education, Longman Cheshire, Melbourne, Australia, 1985.

2. Norman Lacy, "Implementing Change: A Personal View" in Frazer, Dunstan and Creed (eds.), op. cit., p.36-37.

3. Tom Moore, "The Change Process from the Inside" in Frazer, Dunstan and Creed (eds.), op. cit., p.302.

4. A public announcement and a media release from the Minister was made on 30 May, 1979. Note especially the references to this statement by the Minister in his chapter, Alan J. Hunt, "A Government Thrusts Towards Change", p.15, and by Rodney L. Reed, "Consultative Processes in the Policy Formulation State of a Major Review", p.318, in Frazer, Dunstan and Creed (eds.) Perspectives on Organisational Change: Lessons from Education, op. cit.

5. Rodney L. Reed, op cit. p.319.

6. Tom Moore, op. cit., p.306.

7. This assertion has been supported by personal comments made by the then Director-General, Dr. Shears, on several occasions when discussion of the organisational changes with the writer have taken place.

8. Tom Moore, op. cit., p.306.

9. See discussions on incrementalism in Government departments in Leemans, A.F., (ed.), The Management of Change in Government, Martinus Nijhoff, 1976.

10. Y. Dror, "Strategies for Administrative Reform", in Leemans, A.F. (ed.), op. cit.

11. Norman Lacy, op. cit., p.37.

12. Alan Hunt, "A Government Thrusts Towards Change", in Frazer, Dunstan and Creed (eds.), op. cit., pp. 14-15.

13. Professor Kwong Lee Dow, Dean of Education at the University of Melbourne made this comment when launching the book, Frazer, Dunstan and Creed (eds.), Perspectives on Organisational Change : Lessons from Education, op. cit.

14. Norman Lacy, op. cit., p.38.

15. Geoff. Maslen used this term in writing in "The Age" newspaper, op. cit.

16. Robert Fordham, "A New Government's Organisational Review", in Frazer, Dunstan and Creed (eds.), op. cit., p.59.

17. The Minister made this statement in the Legislative Assembly of the Victorian Parliament in reply to a question without notice on 26 Nov. 1985. See Victorian Parliamentary Debates, Victorian Government Printing Office, p.2354.

18. John Halligan and Michael O'Grady, "Public Sector Reform : Exploring the Victorian Experience", an unpublished paper presented at the National Conference of the Australian Institute of Public Administration, Murdoch University, 17 Nov. 1984, p.7.

19. Norman Lacy, op. cit., p.36.

20. Alan J. Hunt, op. cit., pp. 16-17.

21. Rodney Reed, "Consultative Processes in the Policy Formulation Stage of a Major Review", in Frazer, Dunstan and Creed (eds.), op. cit.

22. Norman Lacy, op. cit., p.38.

23. Alan J. Hunt and Norman Lacy, Green Paper on Strategies and Structures for Education in Victoria, Victorian Government Printing Office, Melbourne, 1980.

24. Rodney Reed, op. cit., p.328.

25. Norman Lacy, op. cit., p.41.

26. Alan J. Hunt, op. cit., p.22.

27. Norman Lacy, op. cit., p.42.

28. Philip J. Creed, "Installing a New Organisational Structure", in Frazer, Dunstan and Creed, (eds.), op. cit., pp. 382-384.

29. Robert Fordham, op. cit., p.61.

30. Joan Kirner, "Organisational Change in Education : The Parent Line", in Frazer, Dunstan and Creed (eds.), op. cit., p.362.

31. An advertisement for the position of the Chief Executive appeared in "The Age" newspaper on 7 Dec., 1985. The personnel consultancy firm, AY Executive Resource Consultants Pty.Ltd. (Arthur Young) have been given the task of finding an appropriate person.

32. Norman Lacy, op. cit., p.44.

33. Michael Deeley, "The Implementation Steering Committee and its Contribution to Organisational Change", in Frazer, Dunstan and Creed (eds.), op. cit., p.221.

34. Tom Moore, op. cit., p.305.

35. Michael Deeley, op. cit., p.222.

36. Arthur Rendell, "The Dynamics of Structural Change in the Public Sector", in Frazer, Dunstan and Creed (eds.), p.189.

37. Ibid. p.192.

38. Ibid. p.194.

39. PA Australia, Education Department of Victoria : The Rationale and Definition of the Proposed Organisation Structure (the PA Report), PA Australia, Melbourne, September 1981; reprinted by Victorian Government Printing Office, Melbourne, 1981.

40. John Halligan and Michael O'Grady, op. cit., p.5.

41. Ibid. p.8

42. Program Budget 1983-84, Volume 1 : Overview, Victorian Government Printing Office, Melbourne, Dec. 1983, pp.7-8.

43. Victorian Secondary Teachers Association, V.S.T.A. News, Melbourne, 22 Nov., 1985.

44. John Halligan and Michael O'Grady, op. cit., p.4.

45. Arthur Rendell, op. cit. p.199.

46. Ibid. p.212.

47. Tom Moore, op. cit., p.313.

48. Philip Creed, op. cit., pp.370-374.

49. The guidelines for membership are described in full in Ministerial Paper No.4, School Councils, V.G.P.O., Melbourne, 1983 and Ministerial Paper No.5, Regional Boards of Education, V.G.P.O., Melbourne, 1984. They were prepared by the State Board of Education, not the Education Department. The guidelines were later written into regulations.

50. Norman Lacy, op. cit., pp.50-51.

51. The terms of reference for the Devolution Process Study were contained in a memorandum circulated to officers of the Education Department on 12 Dec., 1984. The terms had been agreed to earlier by the State Board of Education and the Director-General of the Department.

52. Judith Chapman and William Lowe Boyd, "Decentralisation, Devolution and the School Principal : Australian Lessons on State-Wide Educational Reform", a revised unpublished version of a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 1985.

53. Norman Lacy, op. cit., p.34

54. This was stated by the Minister of Education, Lindsay Thompson, in a Press Release, December, 1971.

55. Among the first operational responsibilities given to regional offices was responsibility for administering teacher in-service education programs in local areas. The writer was involved in these negotiations and discussions.

56. The information and copy of the report was provided to the writer by the Assistant Minister of Education, Norman Lacy, during 1981 at the time when regional areas were being reviewed.

57. Lawrie Shears, "The Fragmentation of Power", in Frazer, Dunstan and Creed (eds.), op. cit., p.92.

58. This view was expressed to the writer in a personal response from the former President of the Parents Federation at a seminar on administrative reform in education in November, 1985. It reflects a widely held view among senior Officers in the department.

59. Joan Kirner, op. cit., p.344

60. Alan J. Hunt and Norman Lacy, White Paper on Strategies for Education in Victorian Government Schools, V.G.P.O., Melbourne 1980, p.10. Six key themes for administrative reform were listed. Briefly, they were devolution and decentralisation of power and responsibility, increased participation in education governance, improved consultation, economy and efficiency in management, effective coordination of functions and policies, and internal and external reviews of schools.

61. R.J.W. Selleck, "The Restructuring : Some Historical Reflections", in Frazer, Dunstan and Creed (eds.), op.cit., p.118. An earlier version of this chapter was given as the John Symth Memorial Lecture in 1982, shortly after the publication of the PA Report.

62. William Lowe Boyd refers to his American research on this topic in the paper presented to the 1985 AERA Annual Meeting. See the notes to Chapman and Boyd, op. cit.

63. Richard J. Bates, "The Socio-political Context of Administrative Change", in Frazer, Dunstan and Creed (eds.), op. cit. p.289.

64. Geoff. Maslen, op. cit. He was reflecting on widespread feeling among sections of the Labor party who had rejected the corporate management approach of the previous Liberal Government.

65. R.J.W. Selleck, op. cit., p. 110.

66. Ibid, p.116

67. The five basic principles for administrative reform were set down in Ministerial Paper No.1, Decision-Making in Victorian Education, V.G.P.O. Melbourne, March 1983. The principles were genuine devolution of authority and responsibility to the school community, collaborative decision-making processes, a responsive bureaucracy, effectiveness of educational outcomes and active redress of disadvantage and discrimination.

68. Ministerial Paper No.4, op. cit., p.9

69. Unpublished data from a survey conducted by the Policy and Planning Unit of the Ministry of Education.

70. The view presented is that of Mrs. Marie Tatchell, President of the Association of councils of Technical Institutions in Victoria, in an unpublished address given to newly appointed High School and Technical School principals on 27 Nov., 1983.

71. Norman G. Curry, "Difficulties and Achievements in Implementing Organisational Change", in Frazer, Dunstan and Creed (eds.) op. cit. p.392.

72. Tom Moore, op. cit. p.312, 313.

73. Philip Creed, op. cit. p.387.

74. The view expressed is as reported by Richard Guillatt, in "The Age" newspaper, 4 Feb., 1986. It was reported as a statement from Professor Kwong Lee Dow, Dean of Education at Melbourne University. The main content of the report is an interview with the Minister for Education, Mr. Ian Cathie.

75. Thomas R. Dye, Understanding Public Policy, 2nd ed. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1975, pp.19-21.

1

37 Ibid. p.192.

38 Ibid. p.194

41 Ibid. p.8.

67 The five basic principles for administrative reform were set down in Ministerial Paper No. 11, Decision-Making in Victorian Education, V.G.P.O. Melbourne, March 1983. The principles were genuine devolution of authority and responsibility to the school community, collaborative decision-making processes, a responsive bureaucracy, effectiveness of educational outcomes and active redress of disadvantage and discrimination.

68 Ministerial Paper No.4, op. cit., p.9

70 The view presented is that of Mrs. Marie Tatchell, President of the Association of Councils of Technical Institutions in Victoria, in an unpublished address given to newly appointed High School and Technical School principals on 27 Nov., 1983.